

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claim 19 has been canceled. Claims 1-18 and 20-27 are pending, of which claims 1, 10-11, 13, 15, 20, 22, and 25 have been amended.

Teleconference with Examiner

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's time for our teleconference on April 16, 2007, and the Examiner's efforts to clarify pending issues to advance prosecution of the subject application. Pending claims 1, 13, and the allowable features of claim 24 were discussed with respect to the Fyles reference.

Examiner Woods considered claim amendments and a traversal of the pending rejection based on Fyles. Specifically, the feature of "reducing the amount of data to send to a client by selecting a larger region" was discussed. Accordingly, the independent claims have been amended to clarify and/or incorporate claim language in an effort to place the application in condition for allowance. However, the Examiner reserved the right to further evaluate the references of record and/or conduct a further search for any additional references. An RCE is filed herewith.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 24 has been allowed (*Office Action* p.2). Applicant appreciates the indication of allowability. This claim remains unchanged and is in condition for allowance.

1 **35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections**

2 **A.** Claims 1, 7-9, 14, 19-21, and 25-26 are rejected under
3 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,437,803 to
4 Panasyuk *et al.* (hereinafter, “Panasyuk”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,877,027 to
5 Spencer *et al.* (hereinafter, “Spencer”) (*Office Action* p.4). Claim 19 is canceled
6 herein.

7 **B.** Claims 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious
8 over Panasyuk in view of Spencer, and further in view of U.S. Patent
9 No. 5,491,780 to Fyles *et al.* (hereinafter, “Fyles”) (*Office Action* p.12).

10 **C.** Claims 2-3, 5-6, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as
11 being obvious over Panasyuk in view of Spencer, and further in view of
12 U.S. Patent No. 6,304,895 to Schneider *et al.* (hereinafter, “Schneider”) (*Office*
13 *Action* p.13).

14 **D.** Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over
15 Panasyuk in view of Spencer, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication
16 No. 2002/0035627,486 to Sutou *et al.* (hereinafter, “Sutou”) (*Office Action* p.16).

17 **E.** Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious
18 over Panasyuk in view of Spencer and Sutou, and further in view of U.S. Patent
19 No. 5,461,716 to Eagen *et al.* (hereinafter, “Eagen”) (*Office Action* p.22).

20 **F.** Claims 4 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being
21 obvious over Panasyuk in view of Spencer, and further in view of U.S. Patent
22 No. 5,682,486 to Grossman *et al.* (hereinafter, “Grossman”) (*Office Action* p.24).
23 Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.
24
25

1 **Claim 1** recites a method implemented at a server device, comprising:

2 gathering region data for displaying a region of a server desktop

3 remotely on a client display, wherein the region data describe a shape and a

4 position of the region;

5 gathering graphics data for the region, wherein the graphics data

6 describe visual content of the region, and wherein the region data and the

7 graphics data are gathered synchronously so as to maintain an association

8 of the region data and the graphics data;

9 sending the region data and the graphics data to a client in a

10 sequential order that represents the association between the region data and

11 the graphics data such that the client can determine which graphics data and

12 region data are related; and

13 in an event that bandwidth becomes too low to send the region data

14 and the graphics data to the client, reducing the amount of data to send by

15 gathering the region data and the graphics data for a larger region that

16 encompasses the region and that requires less data to describe.

17 Claim 1 is amended herein to incorporate features from dependent claim 13

18 based on the allowable subject matter as described with reference to allowed

19 claim 24 (*Office Action* p.3). Specifically, claim 1 recites “reducing the amount of

20 data to send by gathering the region data and the graphics data for a larger region

21 that encompasses the region and that requires less data to describe”. This feature

22 was rejected in view of Fyles in combination with Panasyuk and Spencer.

23 However, the Office recognizes that Panasyuk and Spencer do not disclose

24 reducing the amount of data, as recited in claim 1 (*Office Action* p.12).

25 The Office cites to Fyles col.2, lines 17-27 to the recited feature. Applicant

disagrees because Fyles describes an “updated area” that is only a smaller

proportion of a rectangle to determine an area of a screen for transmission:

1
2 In a preferred embodiment each identified portion of the screen is
3 represented by a rectangle, and it is then the contents of this rectangle that
4 is transmitted to the other computers in the network. The use of a rectangle
5 is computationally very simple, and turns out to correspond to a large
6 majority of updates. In a few cases the update has a more complicated
7 shape, so that possibly a large proportion of the rectangle transmitted has
8 not been updated. This could be avoided by using other shapes, perhaps
9 based on more sophisticated calculations to determine very accurately the
10 updated area of the screen for transmission. (*Fyles* col.2, lines 17-27).

11 Accordingly, *Fyles* does not describe “reducing the amount of data to send
12 by gathering the region data and the graphics data for a larger region that
13 encompasses the region and that requires less data to describe”, as recited in
14 claim 1. Further, *Fyles* teaches away from this recited feature in the last sentence
15 of the cited paragraph. *Fyles* clearly states that extra shape calculations are not
16 contemplated as an innovation:

17
18 However, in general the savings in transmission time would not
19 compensate for the increased processing time required for the extra shape
20 calculations. (*Fyles* col.2, lines 27-30).

21 Accordingly, claim 1 along with dependent claims 7-14 are allowable over
22 the Panasyuk-Spencer-Fyles combination for at least the reasons described above
23 and Applicant requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

24 **Claims 2-3 and 5-6** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon
25 claim 1 which is allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer-Fyles combination for at
least the reasons described above. Claims 2-3 and 5-6 are also allowable over the
Panasyuk-Spencer-Schneider combination because Schneider does not address the

1 deficiencies of Panasyuk, Spencer, and/or Fyles as described above in response to
2 the rejection of claim 1.

3 **Claim 4** is allowable by virtue of its dependency upon claim 1 which is
4 allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer-Fyles combination for at least the reasons
5 described above. Claim 4 is also allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer-Grossman
6 combination because Grossman does not address the deficiencies of Panasyuk,
7 Spencer, and/or Fyles as described above in response to the rejection of claim 1.

8
9 **Claim 15** recites a remoting synchronization engine, comprising:

10 ...

11 a data output scheduler to send the region data and the graphics data
12 to the client in a sequence which represents the association between the
13 region data and the graphics data, and in an event that bandwidth becomes
14 too low to send the region data and the graphics data to the client, reducing
15 the amount of data to send by gathering the region data and the graphics
16 data for a larger region that encompasses the region and that requires less
17 data to describe.

18 Claim 15 is amended herein to incorporate allowable features as described
19 with reference to allowed claim 24 (*Office Action* p.3). Specifically, claim 15
20 recites “reducing the amount of data to send by gathering the region data and the
21 graphics data for a larger region that encompasses the region and that requires less
22 data to describe”. As described above in response to the rejection of claim 1,
23 Panasyuk, Spencer, and/or Fyles do not teach or suggest the recited feature.
24 Claim 15 is also allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer-Sutou combination because
25 Sutou does not address the deficiencies of Fyles as described above in response to
the rejection of claim 1.

1 Accordingly, claim 15 is allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer-Sutou
2 combination for at least the reasons described above and Applicant requests that
3 the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

4
5 **Claims 16-18** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 15,
6 and are allowable over Panasyuk, Spencer, and/or Sutou for at least the reasons
7 described above in response to the rejection of claim 15. Claims 16-18 are also
8 allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer-Sutou-Eagen combination because Eagen
9 does not address the deficiencies of Panasyuk, Spencer, and/or Sutou as described
10 above in response to the rejection of claim 15.

11
12 **Claim 20** recites a synchronized remoting system, comprising:

13 ...
14 in an event that bandwidth becomes too low to send the region data
15 and the graphics data to the client, reducing the amount of data to send by
16 gathering the region data and the graphics data for a larger region that
17 encompasses the visual region and that requires less data to describe.

18
19 As described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Panasyuk,
20 Spencer, and/or Fyles do not teach or suggest “reducing the amount of data to send
21 by gathering the region data and the graphics data for a larger region that
22 encompasses the visual region and that requires less data to describe”, as recited in
23 claim 20.

24
25 Accordingly, claim 20 along with dependent claim 21 is allowable over the
Panasyuk-Spencer-Fyles combination for at least the reasons described above and
Applicant requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

1 **Claim 22** recites a method, comprising:

2 ...
3 in an event that bandwidth becomes too low to transmit the region
4 data and the graphics data, reducing the amount of data to transmit by
5 gathering the region data and the graphics data for a larger region that
6 encompasses the visual region and that requires less data to describe.

7 Claim 22 is amended herein to incorporate allowable features as described
8 with reference to allowed claim 24 (*Office Action* p.3). Specifically, claim 22
9 recites “reducing the amount of data to transmit by gathering the region data and
10 the graphics data for a larger region that encompasses the visual region and that
11 requires less data to describe”. As described above in response to the rejection of
12 claim 1, Panasyuk, Spencer, and/or Fyles do not teach or suggest the recited
13 feature. Claim 22 is also allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer-Grossman
14 combination because Grossman does not address the deficiencies of Fyles as
15 described above in response to the rejection of claim 1.

16 Accordingly, claim 22 along with dependent claim 23 is allowable over the
17 Panasyuk-Spencer-Grossman combination for at least the reasons described above
18 and Applicant requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

19 **Claim 25** recites “in an event that bandwidth becomes too low to send the
20 region data and the graphics data to the client, reducing the amount of data to send
21 by gathering the region data and the graphics data for a larger region that
22 encompasses the visual region and that requires less data to describe”.

23 As described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Panasyuk,
24 Spencer, and/or Fyles do not teach or suggest “reducing the amount of data to send
25 by gathering the region data and the graphics data for a larger region that

1 encompasses the visual region and that requires less data to describe”, as recited in
2 claim 25.

3 Accordingly, claim 25 is allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer-Fyles
4 combination for at least the reasons described above and Applicant requests that
5 the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

6
7 **Claims 26-27** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 25
8 which is allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer-Fyles combination for at least the
9 reasons described above. Claim 27 is also allowable over the Panasyuk-Spencer-
10 Schneider combination because Schneider does not address the deficiencies of
11 Panasyuk, Spencer, and/or Fyles as described above in response to the rejection of
12 claim 1.

13
14 **Conclusion**

15 Pending claims 1-18 and 20-27 are in condition for allowance, and
16 Applicant respectfully requests issuance of the subject application. If any issues
17 remain that preclude issuance of the application, the Examiner is urged to contact
18 the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

19
20 Respectfully Submitted,

21
22 Dated: April 23, 2007

23 By: / David Morasch 42,905 /
24 David A. Morasch
25 SBMC, p.s.
Reg. No. 42,905
(509) 755-7250